



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

edge—plus personality is my formula for successful teaching.

C. K.

LATIN LITERATURE¹

It has been commonly recognized that Latin literature has two distinct claims upon the attention of the modern mind. It records on the one hand the interpretation of human life reached by a great nation, whose disciplined bravery conquered the known world and whose juristic and administrative genius then slowly worked out the idea of a single imperial nationality for all the diverse peoples of its wide domain. This conception of the possible political unity of mankind, first partially and but momentarily realized in the empire of Alexander the Great, was discerned again by Polybius as he sought to understand the reasons why in half a century the civilized world had fallen under the sway of Rome. In the train of conquest followed organization, and with two exceptions, the Greek and the Jew, ultimate assimilation. A common language sufficiently flexible to adjust itself to the new demands made upon it, a common law whose development had long been profoundly influenced by the Stoic doctrine of an eternal law of nature superior in its authority to any specific human legislation, the movements of trade and commerce made possible by the widespread *pax Romana*, all tended to bind closely together the manifold elements of the Empire. Caracalla's extension of Roman citizenship to all free inhabitants of the Roman world, though not so intended, was but a natural recognition of existing conditions. "The Syrian, the Pannonian, the Briton, the Spaniard, was proud to call himself a Roman". And presently with this idea of a civil unity there came to be most intimately associated the idea of a religious unity, so that for centuries the belief in the eternal existence of the Church carried with it as a necessary consequence a belief in the endless duration of the Empire. For thousands of human beings Rome thus came to be a spiritual idea rather than a definitely localized city. Strange, indeed, it would be if the literature of a nation so virile, so constructive, whose career determined the whole subsequent course of Western European history, were not at least sufficiently expressive of the national genius to command our most serious consideration.

But there is another aspect of Latin literature of the greatest historical importance. It was Rome who assimilated and transmitted to the Western world the culture of Greece. During those five hundred years in which the city on the Tiber gradually fought her way from the position of a struggling little community in the midst of menacing neighbors to the assured control of the whole Italian peninsula, the Greeks, already possessed of their

Homer, invented and brought to perfection in various parts of the Greek-speaking world the fundamental types of literary expression in poetry and in prose. It was practically inevitable that when, upon the conquest of Magna Graecia and through the later wars in Greece and in the Hellenized East, the ruling class at Rome became acquainted with the masterpieces of Greek art and letters, captive Greece should, in Horace's phrase, take captive her rude conqueror. A generation succeeded whose education from youth up was full of Greek influences. The younger Scipio Africanus, a man of wonderful ability, many-sidedness and taste, possessed of a most winning personality, became the leader of a circle of statesmen and writers who were confident of the nation's future, enthusiastic over the new culture, and convinced that the language might most surely and most swiftly be molded into the medium for a great national literature by the close study of Greek models. The tide of Hellenism came to its flood in the prose of Cicero and the poetry of Vergil, the one the most widely cultivated mind of all antiquity, the other, in Bacon's words, "the chastest poet and royalet that to the memory of man is known", and both, in the influence which they exerted alike upon the minds of the generations which immediately followed them and in the intellectual life of Western Europe since the Renaissance, as all pervasive as Latinity itself. The unity of the Empire and the ease of communication between its parts led to the wide diffusion of this Graeco-Roman culture throughout the provinces. It was an integral element in the life of the new nationalities, and even the reentrance upon the scene in the fifteenth century of the Greek originals themselves failed to deprive it of its primacy as a formative power. It was still the Latin writers who were models of style and whose ideas swayed the development of art and letters. Not until the eighteenth century did Greek come really into its own.

One of the fruits of the nineteenth century was the formulation and wide application of the historical and comparative method in the study of all the results of human activity. To the investigators and critics who thus followed the stream of literature back to its fountain heads this second aspect of Latin literature seemed to be of paramount significance. The unquestioned indebtedness of Rome to Greece in all the technique of form, the constant and, at times, even minute use by the Latin writer of the rich material gathered in the earlier literature seemed to these students to make Latin at the best but a pale and ineffectual reflex of the Greek. But already there is evidence that a different and saner view will presently obtain. It is being pointed out that we cannot thus estimate Latin literature without including in the same condemnation much

¹ See page 178, note 1.

of that which is most justly admired in our modern literatures. When once the literary types have been worked out, there remains but one possible originality, an originality of personality and spirit. Man is inevitably the heir of the ages, and "with the process of the suns" the elements for which he is indebted to the past become as inevitably ever more and more numerous. Even the *Iliad* is now recognized to be a highly artificial production and to presuppose a long anterior period of poetic activity. It has been proven again and again, as, for instance, in the case of the plots of Shakspeare's plays, that a poet may borrow material from others without in any way impairing his own claim to eminent or even preeminent merit. For the supreme test of a great work of art must be found in its unfailing power to give noble pleasure to minds that are sensitive to such beauty, and not in the answer to the question whether the artist has gotten from existing sources the material into which he has himself put this subtle magic. Judged by such a standard rather than by that of their genetic relation to their predecessors, the place of the names that are the glory of Latin literature may be regarded as having long since been fixed by the consensus of opinion of successive generations. More than this, recent studies are revealing with increasing clearness that, while not only in form and rhythm but also (especially in the case of the poets) in idea, phrase, and color they drew freely upon their models, the spirit and total effect of their work is essentially Roman and not Greek. With some striking exceptions, chiefly in the field of drama, this work reflects the environment of the writer, social, political, or religious, and gives expression to the spirit of the time, its moods, gay or severe, its aspirations, self-criticism, or despair. Naevius and Ennius both fought for Rome in the field before they composed their national epics. Horace, in the opinion of a distinguished French critic, M. Pierron, "est, si je l'ose ainsi dire, le siècle d'Auguste en personne". The appeal of Vergil's *Aeneid* to his countrymen was so immediate that to them not Aeneas but the Roman people itself was the real hero. We walk the very streets of Rome and note the manner of the passing throng with Juvenal and Martial. Even Lucretius, who seems so detached a personality, and who is so proud, after the manner of all true Epicureans, of his absolute dependence upon the scrolls of his revered master, produced a poem which is, as Professor John Veitch said some time ago, "a type in the world of thought of the irrepressible Roman spirit of absolute sovereignty and love of orderly rule in the world of practical life and action". And this Roman spirit shows itself not only in the conquering toil with which the masses of disparate phenomena that prove

to him the invariable order of natural law are finally marshaled in a coherent and interrelated series of arguments, but even more in the manner and temper with which this result is achieved. The literary movement of the time was already Alexandrine, with its love of carefully polished work in miniature, learned, romantic, and sentimental. But from the group of young poets of this school to which Catullus, Calvus, and Cinna belonged, Lucretius stood quite aloof. To his eager mind, intensely absorbed in the presentation of that philosophy which would insure in every recipient soul the dethronement of illusion, the reign of reason, most of their work must have seemed mere studied prettiness. How should a poet whose verse reveals an instinctive sympathy with forces that operate on a grand scale in illimitable space and in unending time concern himself with the ephemeral passions and ambitions of the moment? Catullus himself, who immortalizes this moment, was possessed of too vigorous, too Roman, a temperament to be fettered by his Alexandrian technique. Impassioned alike in love and in hate, whether personal or political, he uses a diction extraordinarily lucid and direct. In the longer elegies and in the *epyllion* on the Marriage of Peleus and Thetis there is unmistakable evidence of deliberate art and even artifice. But in the poems that are expressive of his own feeling—and no poet is more egoistic—there is a spontaneity which cannot be matched in any other Latin poet, and the verse is most exquisitely adapted to the shifting phases of emotion.

The poem of Lucretius is in another way characteristically Roman. Epicurus had indeed "traversed throughout in mind and spirit the immeasurable universe whence he returns victorious to tell us what can, what cannot come into being—on what principle each thing has its powers defined, its deepset boundary mark". But this quest had not been undertaken through any desire to enlarge the boundaries of science for its own sake. He had on the contrary, a social aim, to secure the necessary foundation for the most indispensable and universal of all arts, the art of living. Such knowledge as was contributory to this end was of vital importance; all else might, at the best, serve to amuse an idle hour. In this limitation Epicurus is in no wise distinctively Greek. But with the normally constituted Roman the question of the practical results of his labors was always primary. Like Mr. Kipling's typical American, he turned his face naturally to "the instant need of things" and turned it too with much the same "keen, untroubled" gaze. Horace, in the *Epistle* to Augustus in which he champions the modern school of Latin poetry as against the indiscriminate laudation of the classic dead, makes at one point a defense of poetry itself on purely utilitarian grounds. . . .

Cicero, too, found it necessary to justify on like grounds his interest and work in philosophy. That delight in the intellectual life for its own sake, that passion for inquiry and knowledge as the natural food of the human mind which Cicero so enthusiastically describes in a great passage in the last book of his *De Finibus* was by no means native in the Roman mind, and to the majority always appeared to be a vain thing. One recalls with amusement the story told about the proconsul Gellius, a contemporary of Cicero. This progressive governor, with a love of order truly and admirably Roman, called before him upon his arrival at Athens the representatives of the various schools of philosophy and, urging upon them the propriety of making a final adjustment of their differences, offered in perfect good faith his service as mediator. Panaetius, the friend of the younger Scipio, and by far the most influential of all Greek thinkers in winning converts to Stoicism at Rome, gained his success by emphasizing, not the lofty but wholly theoretical conception of virtue held by the earlier Stoics, but an ideal which might be realized in actual life. The new doctrine found congenial soil, for the heroes of Roman tradition were, as has been pointed out, unconscious Stoics. It was found that this view of life, in its idea of a world order to which the individual was bound to conform, in its treatment of the deities of popular belief as manifestations of the one divine Being, in its insistence on the duties which every man owed to society and the State, was in essential harmony with some of the strongest elements in the national character. This theory could be definitely helpful in solving the problems of daily life. It might be used to reinforce the constraining power of the *mos maiorum*, as this was still felt in the organization of the family and the State. And if presently 'the way of the fathers' should cease to be able to provide adequate sanction for personal and civic morality (the Empire saw this danger realized in the extinction of liberty), philosophy might take its place altogether in maintaining the standard. Cicero is much concerned to make clear this practical value of his own labors in this field, to relate them not so much to human life in general as to the particular needs of his countrymen and their historical traditions, to show that, because of the discipline and breadth which it alone could give, the study of philosophy was for a self-governing people, and especially for the statesman and the publicist, a necessary complement of the regular training in literature, law, and oratory. In the series of volumes which appeared in rapid succession in the years 45 and 44 B. C., dealing in part with the criterion of knowledge, in part with the ethical standard, Cicero was, he conceived, meeting a practical need as certainly as in his earlier works on rhetoric and political science.

One of these earlier works, the treatise *On the State*, has come down to us in a very fragmentary condition, but enough remains to enable us to form a definite idea of Cicero's political philosophy. The book offers a most instructive contrast to the famous *Republic* of Plato on which Cicero modeled his own work. The aim of both inquirers is substantially the same; namely, to ascertain the moral principles of an ideal polity and to describe its governmental form. But the earlier thinker, approaching the problem in the spirit of a speculative philosopher in search of the absolute good, works out with inflexible logic the consequences of that principle of justice which must be realized both in the State and in its citizens. The result is the construction of a marvelously intricate and inter-related social organism, a book crowded with ideas and ideals of permanent value. But the State, as specifically constituted, is wholly theoretical, at variance with all human experience and incapable of realization. The Roman, though he has a most engaging enthusiasm for great ideas, is far too completely the child of his race to put any faith in a series of abstract ethical propositions and their necessary corollaries. He, too, describes an ideal State, but he is evidently, after all, idealizing an actually tested form of government; namely, the constitution of Rome as it existed in the time of the younger Scipio Africanus. . . .

Important as it was in Cicero's judgment that his countrymen should be made familiar with the subject-matter of Greek philosophy, it was no less important that these ideas should be presented in a style that would serve both to win for them a readier hearing and to enrich the literature with an artistic form not hitherto represented. The undertaking bristled with difficulties. There was as yet in existence in Latin no treatment of philosophy in prose of the slightest scientific or literary value. Lucretius indeed had lived; but his work was in poetry, and dealt with one single school of thought and in the main with only one aspect, the physical and mechanical, of the teaching of even that school. It was necessary to create a philosophical vocabulary; and, while even the plastic Greek had only in the hands of a long succession of thinkers become wholly adequate for the expression of abstract thought, Latin, a language which finds perhaps the most striking monument of its purely native capacity in the objective concreteness of Caesar's *Commentaries*, had to be made through the genius of a single worker an instrument of like power. The notable success which was achieved would no doubt have been impossible if Cicero had not profited to the utmost by the terminology already worked out in Greek. Even so considered, it was an amazing feat, the far-reaching importance of which did not appear until long after his death. For, as the

event proved, it was Cicero who made possible the Latinity of the Church Fathers from Minucius Felix to Saint Augustine, and to whom the scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages owed the medium requisite for its expression.

Whence came this marvelous power over language, which from the days of Quintilian, his ardent admirer, made Cicero the most potent influence in Roman education, which in the Renaissance captivated Petrarch, and, through that great movement in which Petrarch was the leader, placed Cicero in his commanding position as a literary artist? The answer must be found in the development of oratory at Rome. In Tacitus's *Dialogue* on this subject, it is pointed out in defense of the oratory of the Republic and of Cicero as its greatest representative that "it may be said of eloquence, as of a flame, that it requires motion to excite it, fuel to feed it, and that it brightens as it burns". For "the mental powers of the orator rise with the dignity of his subject and no one can produce a noble and brilliant speech unless he has an adequate case". As Tacitus was only too well aware, great eloquence is most intimately connected with the vigor and freedom of national life. When that life is instinct with great ideas and principles, when the minds and passions of men are deeply stirred by political and social movements of grave import to the commonwealth, the conditions are most favorable for a native eloquence, and, if training be added, for a great style. In the survey of the development of Roman oratory which Cicero has given to us in the *Brutus* it is clear that, from the day when Appius Claudius Caecus made against the conclusion of a peace with Pyrrhus the first published speech in Roman annals, the fiercely disputed questions of internal and foreign policy and the sessions of the law-courts resulted in a continuous improvement of a practical art, which was most congenial to the Roman temperament. The elder Cato, Gaius Gracchus, Crassus and Antonius, the teachers of Cicero in his youth, Hortensius, his great rival at the bar, "the king of the courts", mark the steps of a progress from rude natural effectiveness to artistic excellence that we can ourselves trace even in the tantalizingly few fragments of their speeches which have been preserved. With Cicero our data become abundant, for there are extant fifty-seven out of over one hundred speeches which he delivered. These speeches, studied in connection with his masterly treatises on the ideal orator, prove that not only did he bring Latin prose style to the highest point of formal development, but also that in one very real sense he may actually be called its founder. The earlier orators, it is true, had learned much from Greek rhetoricians, alive and dead, about the harmony which should exist between form and content, but Cicero was the

first to work out and to use on a large scale a comprehensive theory of oratory as a fine art, in so far as it might be capable of realization in Roman life and in the Latin tongue. This theory was the slow fruition of close study of Greek masters and masterpieces, and he is peculiarly indebted to Isocrates, to whom, in fact, in Greek literature also all subsequent prose-writers were ultimately indebted for the rhythmical swell of the periodic sentence. By the most intense and unremitting application, by the devotion of a lover to his art, Cicero made himself a consummate master of rhetorical structure, of phrase, and of cadence. Neither Flaubert nor Stevenson ever worked more passionately than he to achieve style, to cast his thoughts into such a form as to satisfy at once the critical mind and the critical ear. The prose which he thus perfected was naturally the prose of the orator, the prose of one who addressed an actual audience. When later he began to adapt it to meet the needs of the treatise and the essay, it was still a prose that was shaped to yield its meaning and its charm on the first reading. In fact, even those of his works that were intended to be read rather than to be heard are cast in the form of the dialogue. The same tone naturally appears in his *Letters*. Their vivacity and changing moods reproduce the movement of animated conversation, and in nothing that he has left to us is the sureness and ease of his control of the language more striking. His correspondents, men of distinction though they were, fall markedly below his level.

In that dialogue of Tacitus to which I have already referred, it is claimed by the admirer of the republican oratory that, "while the style of Caesar is the more transparent, the style of Cicero is the more impassioned, the richer, the more forcible". As none of Caesar's speeches has survived, we have no means of verifying the estimate of Cicero, who places him in the very first rank, but we are probably justified in forming some idea of the secret of his success through his *Commentaries* on the Gallic and Civil wars. These "materials for the study of history" are presented in a manner that, for its purity of idiom, lucidity, and terseness, is, as Cicero says in the *Brutus*, the despair of professed historians. Still, unadorned as is the style, the sentences flow and are woven together into a continuous web. But already a different ideal of writing had found its great representative. Historical composition had begun at Rome with the *Origins* of the elder Cato, whose motto had been "make sure of the sense, and the words will follow". The practical value of history was evident to the Roman mind, and this field was accordingly much cultivated. Under the Empire, indeed, the historians became the foremost representatives of prose. But historiography developed slowly; and Sallust,

contemporary with Cicero and Caesar, was the first to use a scientific method and an artistic form. Attracted by Thucydides rather than by Isocrates, he worked out a new type of Latin prose style, highly compressed in thought and in expression, abrupt and epigrammatic. He is a lover of the words and phrases of a bygone age, with a special fondness for Cato. His sentences, for the most part short and simple in their structure, follow one another staccato fashion. Quintilian speaks admiringly of his "immortal swiftness". It is a style quite conscious of its own art, which it by no means attempts to conceal. Next to Cicero, Sallust is the chief model in prose for the following centuries. Tacitus learned of him, and still later, in an archaizing age, he is highly regarded by Fronto and by Gellius.

The two fundamentally opposed ideals of form which came to expression in the prose of Cicero and of Sallust, respectively, were destined to receive under the Empire a most characteristic and most splendid realization in the historical work of two geniuses of the first rank. The governing factor in the development of republican prose had been the need, imperative in spoken discourse, of being understood at once, as the words succeeded one another. The style had to be fused with the thought, and, like it, had to be such as to win instant appreciation. But with the loss of freedom and the decline of oratory conditions changed. The appeal was then made even more to a reading than to a listening public. The gentle reader might linger over the art of the writer, and this art in turn might be made so intricate in its nice balance of phrase and clause, so daring in the compactness of its thought and structure, so subtly suggestive in the literary associations of its diction, as to reveal its full charm and power only after some attentive consideration. It is in this fashion that Livy continues the Ciceronian tradition, and Tacitus the Sallustian. The two men are as wide apart in temperament and method as they are different in manner. Judged by modern standards, Livy is in no sense a scientific historian. To examine, whenever possible, original sources, to sift with a critical and open mind a mass of conflicting evidence, to search for the truth with an austere disregard of the possible resultant destruction of one's own cherished opinions, all this was alien to his enthusiastic soul. He never consciously misrepresents the facts, but he is essentially a hero-worshiper, and his greatest hero is the Roman Commonwealth itself. "Fallen on evil times", as he thinks, he idealizes the great past, and, conceiving, as we read in his famous preface, that it is the function of history to teach good citizenship, he is unconsciously predisposed to accept that form of the story which will enable him to point his moral most effectively. Yet such is his innate sympathy and kinship with the elements

of character which made Rome great that, notwithstanding grave deficiencies, his work has an enduring truth and value. It is really a prose epic, written in a style of extraordinary eloquence and picturesqueness. . . .

A great modern historian, Leopold von Ranke, says of Tacitus: "If one yields to the impression made by his works, one is carried away by it. There is no trace in him of the manner and method of Greek historiography. He is Roman through and through, and indeed the master of all who have written before or since". Unlike Livy, Tacitus brought to the help of his historical investigation the practical training gained in a long and distinguished official career. In the opening paragraphs of the *Histories* and the *Annals* he avows his intention to write with perfect freedom from prejudice. A thorough aristocrat and lover of the old order, he saw, nevertheless, that the Empire was definitely established. He could even fully appreciate the enlightened rule of a Trajan. But the fifteen years of "silent servitude" under Domitian had permanently embittered his soul, and despite his best efforts the prevailing somberness of his thoughts profoundly influenced his judgment as a historian. Though by no means unerring in his analysis, he was endowed by nature with a marvelous power to trace the hidden springs of thought and action. His portrayal of character is subtle and vivid. The phrases bite as does the acid in etching. The style is charged with imagination, and everywhere in the diction one sees the influence of Vergil, to whom alike as artist and as patriot his own personality was so closely akin.

Nothing in the whole range of Latin literature illustrates more strikingly its close connection with the national character and the need of the time than the work of Rome's greatest poet. The long years of civil strife that terminated in the battle of Actium had exhausted Italy, had substituted factional bitterness for the sense of a common country and had made of slight effect the traditional moral and religious sanctions of civic conduct. Augustus and his ministers, confronted by the urgent need of reconstruction, called into play remedial forces of very varied kinds. Among these was literature. Vergil's *Georgics* is not a poem born of the love of Nature for her own sake—though Vergil shows such love—nor does it treat of the life of man in the country in any cosmopolitan way. Italy is the theme and the Roman virtues and strength of character fostered by the hard struggle with the reluctant yet bountiful earth. For agriculture was, if possible, to be again honorably esteemed, as in the days when Cincinnatus left his plow to guide the State. The poem is the quintessence of long musing on the subject in one of the loveliest parts of Italy and of a study of the effects of word and phrase that was almost microscopic. The fruit of seven full years

of labor was a poem of 2200 lines—less, on the average, than a line a day. But this poem at once made its author the object “of a people’s hope”. And this hope was justified in the Aeneid. Here Vergil shows himself to be one of that very small number of poets who appeal to the universal heart of man. No other poem in the world’s literature is more many-sided, no other has played so large a part in the mental life of so many generations of men. Yet Vergil was far from consciously writing for any such audience. He “sounds forever of Imperial Rome”, whose finer life he strove adequately to express and to quicken. Possessed in the highest degree of that catholic receptivity which both Polybius and Posidonius noted as among the admirable qualities of the Roman mind, he used as by natural right the imaginative interpretation of human life of his great predecessors, whether Greek or Roman. But he puts upon all the stamp of his own personality, essentially Roman in his purpose and totality of effect, even where the material is most Homeric.

“Our wills are ours, to make them Thine.” It would be impossible to define here the full significance of the Aeneid. Professedly a poem of action, it is in fact a musing upon the mystery of human life, upon its infinite pathos, its uncertain issue, its permitted greatness. To the modern world, with its apotheosis of the individual man, Aeneas, as Vergil has drawn him, is apt to seem rather a concept than a real human being. Yet he incarnates the virtues upon which, to the poet’s mind, depended the realization of the high hopes of the new order. The age had learned to its cost the meaning of personal ambition. Vergil held up to it the contrasted picture of patience, self-control, and obedience to the divine call. Through such forgetfulness of self, and through this alone, it had been possible to lay the foundations of the State; through the same high devotion Rome had grown great. In no other way could her life be preserved and enriched for the generations to come.

Horace, Vergil’s contemporary, is in another way equally the child of his age and responsive to the movement of the time. Between the Homeric Odysseus and the Vergilian Aeneas, says Sainte-Beuve, “l’urbanité était née”. Horace, as ready in his address as Vergil was shy and awkward, is, in a special sense, the representative in Latin literature of this temper and manner. It is not, of course, peculiar to his works. We admire it also, for instance, in the distinguished Romans who figure in Cicero’s dialogue *On the Orator*. In the poet’s familiar ‘Talks’ and ‘Letters’ we are listening to an accomplished man of the world. Fully aware of the difficulties which beset the pathway of life, he criticizes with kindly humor and tolerance the foibles and errors of others, and derives from his own amusement which he shares with his readers. Yet,

with all this gaiety of tone, he pursues, true Roman that he is, a very practical end; namely, the determination of the principles by which one may order one’s life aright. The teaching of the schools gave him, no doubt, greater breadth of view, but Horace’s philosophy of life is ultimately the outcome of that habit of shrewd observation of courses of action and their results which his father had so sedulously fostered. It finds expression even in his lyric poetry, on which his fame as a great literary artist chiefly rests. “The light that never was on sea or land” comes not to him. But if, even in the Odes, we have “the light of common day”, it is none the less a world touched with the hues of fancy and with man’s finer tastes and hopes. Like Vergil, he is in full sympathy with the efforts of the new régime to restore the ideals of the past. The noble series of odes that opens the third book is in effect a single poem in which Horace commends *virginibus puerisque* the moral qualities that should be theirs, both as individuals and as citizens of Rome.

One may and one should I think, find in Latin literature the reflection of the same continuously developing national life. A number of instances have been discussed to show the intimate relation that existed between these two things. But a few cases only have been taken out of a possible many. One might go farther and point out how in the early days of the literature the rollicking fun and wit of Plautus assume forms which could not possibly have been derived from his Greek originals and whose spirit is truly Italian; how Terence gave to the still undisciplined language a polish that delighted even the critical taste of the Ciceronian age and justly prided himself upon being a well of “Latin undefiled”. One might note the brilliancy with which Ovid’s verse mirrors the gay, cultivated, and cynical society of the world’s capital in the beginning of the Imperial era. Juvenal’s pitiless indictment of his time must be corrected by the cheerful optimism of the younger Pliny, who is as circumstantial in his praise of the persons and things that were good as is Juvenal in his indignation with the persons and things that were evil. And so one might deal with many a name. The language, too, shows a homogeneous growth from the writers of the third century before Christ to Boethius in the sixth century A. D. Inherently sonorous and dignified, inherently logical in the structure of its sentences, as, for instance, in the predominating use of the principle of subordination as against that of coordination, it reflects in point after point the mental traits of the people that used it. If it is ever true that “le style est l’homme”, then one must see in the Latin language and its literature the unmistakable impress of the race whose consummate genius was for law and order and government.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

NELSON G. MCCREA.